UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/593,358	09/19/2006	Ronald A. Gidseg	20040050	1281	
	22500 7590 09/03/2009 BAE SYSTEMS			EXAMINER	
PO BOX 868	02061 0060	ALSOMIRI, ISAM A			
NASHUA, NH 03061-0868			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3662		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/03/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/593,358	GIDSEG ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	ISAM ALSOMIRI	3662				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 M</u>	av 2000					
· <u> </u>	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
closed in accordance with the practice under L	x parte Quayle, 1955 C.D. 11, 40	0.0.210.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-20</u> is/are pending in the application.	·) Claim(s) <u>2-20</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>9-20</u> is/are withdrawn	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>9-20</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-8</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
Old Glaim(3) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on <u>19 September 2006</u> is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some color None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6)					

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 9-20 withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected groups, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on May 5, 2009.

Applicant's election with traverse of group (I) claim 2-8 in the reply filed on May 5, 2009 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that "Examiner can search and examine the entire application without serious burden". This is not found persuasive because the same references can not cover all the groups, and each group requires a separate search to cover the details of the limitations.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landau et al 5,638,164 in view of Deaett et al US 6,072,889.

Referring to claim 2, Landau discloses in figures 1-3 a tracking system comprising: capturing at least one lower-resolution image within a field of view of the

missile warning system; identifying a threat from the captured lower-resolution image or images (col. 2:26-38);; identifying features surrounding the threat from a captured lower-resolution image utilized in identifying the threat (col. 2:31-33); capturing a higher-resolution image within a field of view of the fine tracking system; and identifying a location of a threat within this captured higher-resolution image as a function of the identified features (col. 2:39-45).

Landau does not teach sensing infrared radiation emitted by the threat.

However, passive tracking systems are well known. Deaett teaches a similar tracking system where the system detects infrared light emitted by the threat. It would have been obvious to detect light emitted by the threat and not use a laser source since the target can be detected without using a transmitter.

Referring to claims 2-8, Landau teaches sensing infrared radiation (see col. 1;10-21), capturing a sequence of low-resolution images until a target is found "features", or any other criteria "threshold" and identifying the threat from the high resolution image (see col. 2:62 to col. 3:21).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 3662

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ISAM ALSOMIRI whose telephone number is (571)272-6970. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Tarcza can be reached on 571-272-6979. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Application/Control Number: 10/593,358 Page 5

Art Unit: 3662

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Isam Alsomiri/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3662

August 31, 2009